

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ANTHONY BRODZKI,

Plaintiff,

v.

TARRANT COUNTY SHERIFF,

Defendant.

2:12-CV-40 JCM (VCF)

ORDER

Presently before the court is *pro se* plaintiff Anthony J. Brodzki's third motion for temporary restraining order. (Doc. #12). Plaintiff requests this court to issue a temporary restraining order to "shut off the equipment" (Doc. #12). Plaintiff previously moved for temporary restraining orders on February 13, 2012, (doc. #7) and March 16, 2012 (doc. #9). The court denied those motions. (Docs. #8 and #11).

According to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65, a court may issue a temporary restraining order when the moving party provides specific facts showing that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result before the adverse party's opposition to a motion for preliminary injunction can be heard. The Supreme Court has stated that courts must consider the following factors in determining whether to issue a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction: (1) a likelihood of success on the merits; (2) a likelihood of irreparable injury if preliminary relief is not granted; (3) balance of hardships; and (4) advancement of the public interest. *Winter v. N.R.D.C.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008).

1 Plaintiff's requested relief is too vague to be appropriate for injunctive relief. Further,
2 plaintiff has not made a sufficient showing under the four *Winter* factors. (See Doc. #16).

3 Accordingly,

4 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that *pro se* plaintiff Anthony
5 J. Brodzki's third motion for temporary restraining order (doc. #12) be, and the same hereby is,
6 DENIED.

7 DATED May 3, 2012.

8
9 
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28